

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1-25 were rejected. By this paper, Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 5-7, 15, 16, 18, 19, 22, 24, and 25. These amendments do not add any new matter and support for the amendments may be found at least on page 7, lines 1-11, page 7, line 21-page 8, line 2, page 8, lines 4-11, page 10, lines 12-13, and page 17, lines 5-7. Upon entry of these amendments, claims 1-25 remain pending in the present application and are believed to be in condition for allowance. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 7, 8, 13, 14, 16-22, 24 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Maes, U.S. Patent No. 7,418,382 (hereinafter “Maes”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection since the cited reference fails to anticipate each and every limitation of the claimed invention.

Omitted Features of Independent Claims 1, 5, 16, 19, 24, and 25

The Maes reference fails to anticipate each element of independent claims 1, 5, 16, 19, 24, and 25. Independent claim 1 recites, in part, “A signal processor...configured to access the respective independent application at the entry point directly at a level of a menu hierarchy of the plurality of independent applications upon receipt of the token.” (Emphasis added.)

Similarly, independent claim 5 recites, in part, “a browser module configured to acquire the token and to access an entry point for one of a plurality of independent applications based upon the token directly at a level of a menu hierarchy of the plurality of independent applications.” (Emphasis added.)

Independent claim 16 recites, in part, “accessing an entry point in second processing hardware of one of the plurality of independent applications based upon the constituent of the

composite grammar, wherein the entry point is accessed directly at a level of a menu hierarchy of the one of the plurality of independent applications.” (Emphasis added.)

Independent claim 19 recites, in part, “programming instructions stored on the computer-readable medium for accessing an entry point of one of the plurality of independent applications based upon the constituent of the composite grammar, wherein the entry point is accessed directly at a level of a menu hierarchy of the one of the plurality of independent applications.” (Emphasis added.)

Independent claim 24 recites, in part, “storing programming instructions for accessing an entry point of one of the plurality of independent applications based upon the constituent of the composite grammar on the computer-readable medium, wherein the entry point is accessed directly at a level of a menu hierarchy of the one of the plurality of independent applications.” (Emphasis added.)

Independent claim 25 recites, in part, a “encoding at least one signal processing device with code programmed to...access an entry point directly at a level of a menu hierarchy of one of a plurality of independent applications based upon the constituent of the composite grammar.” (Emphasis added.)

Accordingly, each of amended independent claims 1 and 5 recite a device configured to access an entry point directly at a level of a menu hierarchy of the plurality of independent applications. Similarly, each of independent claims 16, 19, and 24 recite an ability to access an entry point directly at a level of a menu hierarchy of the plurality of independent applications, while independent claim 25 recites code programmed to access an entry point directly at a level of a menu hierarchy of one of a plurality of independent applications. That is, for example, a constituent of the composite grammar may be utilized to directly access a specific level of a menu hierarchy across a plurality of various independent applications. See specification, page 16, lines 12-17 and page 18, lines 5-10. Thus, each of independent claims 1, 5, 16, 19, and 24 allow access of an entry point directly at a level of a menu hierarchy of

independent applications instead of, for example, completing a transaction in a first application and exiting the first application prior to initiating a second application for completing a second transaction in the second application. *See* Specification, page 8, lines 4-11 and page 7, lines 7-11.

In contrast, Maes appears to disclose, at best, downloading a single conventional markup language (CML) page as well as utilizing spider script to scrawl through the requested CML page to extract information for the formation of a graph tree (skeleton). *See* Maes, FIG. 2: ref. 200 and 202; col. 3, lines 37-43; col. 4, lines 49-57; and col. 9, lines 14-16. This tree graph (skeleton) is disclosed by Maes to capture and activate all portions of dialog of the downloaded CML page. *See* Maes, col. 8, lines 14-24. Additionally, the skeleton of Maes may utilize the captured and activated portions of dialog of the downloaded CML page to allow a user to jump between dialogs in the downloaded CML page that would otherwise require a user to navigate through the dialog to activate that portion of the dialog. *See* Maes, col. 9, lines 30-42.

However, Maes further discloses that if a link is activated by user dialog that corresponds to a separate application (a new CML page or site), then a new site corresponding to the second application will be downloaded (*see* Maes, FIG. 2: ref. 208) and the graph tree generation process will proceed to begin anew with the forming (*see* Maes, FIG. 2: ref. 202) or downloading (*see* Maes, FIG. 2: ref. 203) of a new skeleton corresponding to the newly accessed application (site). *See* Maes, col. 9, lines 55-59. Thus, the initial skeleton disclosed by Maes may only allow for various access of a single application downloaded as a CML page, since any subsequent application (CML page) causes a new skeleton to be formed or downloaded. Accordingly, Maes cannot be read as disclosing allow access of an entry point directly at a level of a menu hierarchy of independent applications, as recited in independent claims 1, 5, 16, 19, 24, and 25, since the disclosed skeleton of Maes allows, at best, access of a single application and not access of an entry point directly at a level of a menu hierarchy of independent applications. Moreover, there is no disclosure in Maes that a command given by a user for access of an independent application (a site to be

downloaded in step 208 of FIG. 2 of Maes) provides access of an entry point directly at a level of a menu hierarchy of the independent application, since the flow chart illustrated in FIG. 2 of Maes does not appear to disclose accessing the independent application directly at a level of a menu hierarchy until a user query is repeated in step 205 or 209 of FIG. 2 of Maes. That is, to access a second application in the system of Maes, it appears that steps 201, 202 or 203, 204, and 205 or 206 are disclosed as being performed prior to access to a level in the second application. *See* Maes, FIG. 2. Thus, because each of steps 201, 202 or 203, 204, and 205 or 206 of Maes are disclosed as being performed prior to accessing a level in the second application, Maes cannot be read as disclosing allowing access of an entry point directly at a level of a menu hierarchy of independent applications.

Therefore, Maes fails to disclose all elements of independent claims 1, 5, 16, 19, 24, and 25, and, thus, cannot anticipate the claims under Section 102. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of independent claims 1, 5, 16, 19, 24, and 25, as well as all claims depending therefrom.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, claims 6, 9, and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Maes, in view of Deneberg et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,158,936 (hereinafter “Deneberg”), and claims 11, 12, 15 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable in view of Maes in view of Neuberger et al., U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0153322 (hereinafter “Neuberger”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejection since the cited references fail to teach each and every limitation of the claimed invention.

Omitted Features of Dependent Claims 6, 9, 10-12, 15, and 23

Claims 6, 9, 10-12, 15, and 23 depend from independent claims 5 and 19, respectively. As discussed above, the cited portion of Maes fails to disclose all the elements of independent claims 5 and 19, namely “a browser module configured to acquire the token and to access an entry point for one of a plurality of independent applications based upon the token directly at a level of a menu hierarchy of the plurality

of independent applications” and “programming instructions stored on the computer-readable medium for accessing an entry point of one of the plurality of independent applications based upon the constituent of the composite grammar, wherein the entry point is accessed directly at a level of a menu hierarchy of the one of the plurality of independent applications.” (Emphasis added.) Moreover, the cited portions of Deneberg and Neuberger fail to obviate the deficiencies of Maes.

Thus, the cited portions of Maes, Deneberg, and Neuberger, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the all recitations of independent claims 5 and 19. Therefore, due to at least the dependency of claims 6, 9, 10-12, 15, and 23 from independent claims 5 and 19, respectively, the cited references cannot render obvious claims 6, 9, 10-12, 15, and 23 because they fail to teach or suggest all the features incorporated by dependent claims 6, 9, 10-12, 15, and 23. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of dependent claims 6, 9, 10-12, 15, and 23.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks and amendments set forth above, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview will help speed this application toward issuance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 26, 2010

/Matthew C. Dooley/
Matthew C. Dooley
Reg. No. 61,996
FLETCHER YODER
7915 FM 1960 West, Suite 330
Houston, TX 77070
(281) 970-4545